



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/470,003 06/06/95 ASGHAR

S 19516/189

B3M1/1016

MEKY, M EXAMINER

FOLEY & LARDNER  
3000 K STREET NW  
SUITE 500  
PO BOX 25696  
WASHINGTON DC 20007-8696

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2317

DATE MAILED: 10/16/95

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 06/06/95 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), — days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.                 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.                  |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.     | 6. <input type="checkbox"/>  |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 23-341 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims — are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☒ Claims 1-22 have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims — are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 23-34 are rejected.

5. ☐ Claims — are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims — are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☒ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on —. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on —, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed —, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. —; filed on —.

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 2317

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

4. Claims 23, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cutts (US Pat. No. 4965717).

Art Unit: 2317

5. As to claim 23 & 30, Cutts shows in Fig 1, an apparatus comprising the following:

- \* a first processor 11;
- \* a second processor 12;
- \* a first memory within the memory 14; and
- \* a second memory within the memory 14, see the abstract, lines 13-19, col 2, lines 47-49, lines 52-56, col 31, lines 47-68, col 32, lines 1-52, col 33, lines 50-64, col 34, lines 17-31, lines 46-55, lines 63-64, and col 35, lines 1-4.

6. As to claim 26, each of the processors are a streamlined processor, see col 2, lines 27-28.

7. As to claims 31-32, the claims are similar in scope to claims 23 & 30, and they are rejected under the same rationale, see paragraph 5 above.

Therefore, it can be seen from paragraphs 5-7 that Cutts anticipated claims 23, and 30-32.

8. Claims 24-25, 27-29, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Cutts in view of Nagai (US Pat. No. 5161209).

9. As to claim 24, Cutts shows in Fig 1, an apparatus as been discussed in paragraph 5 above. Cutts does not disclose that the two processors 11 & 12 operate independently of each other.

Art Unit: 2317

However, Nagai shows in Fig 1, a servo system having two independently operated processors 201 & 301, see the abstract, lines 1-4, col 2, lines 42-48. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Nagai with the system of Cutts to control a system using independent operated processors in order to increase the system functionality (since there are two independent processors, each of them would perform different function), see col 3, lines 21-50.

10. As to claims 25 & 27, Nagai teaches that processor 201 (first processor) would control the function of the reel servo 220 and the capstan servo 240, and the second processor 301 would control the function of the drum servo 310, see col 3, lines 21-50.

11. As to claim 28, Nagai teaches that each of the buses 202 & 302 would perform as input and output circuities.

12. As to claim 29, obviously, each of the processors 201 & 301 could be configured to execute schedule control routine.

13. As to claims 33-34, the claims are similar in scope to claims 24 & 27, see paragraphs 9-10 above.

Therefore, it can be seen from paragraphs 9-13 that the combination of Cutts and Nagai teaches the limitations of claims 24-25, 27-29, and 33-34.

Serial Number: 08/470,003

-5-

Art Unit: 2317

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


\* Dann teaches a real time data processing system.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Moustafa M.Meky whose telephone number is (703) 305-9697.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9697.

M.M.M.

September 28, 1995.

  
EXAMINER  
MUSTAF A M MEKY  
703 305 9697